

-11-

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action mailed on September 3, 2008, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration. Claim(s) 1-8, 10-24, and 26-28 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 11, 14, 24 and 26 have been amended. Claims 7-8, 12 and 21 have been canceled. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claim(s) 1-8, 10-24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Trinon et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138571 A1, (hereinafter Trinon) in view of Gauvin et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,197,489 B1 (hereinafter Gauvin).

Applicants respectfully submit that under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) US Patent No. 7,197,489 B1 (assigned to EMC Corporation), commonly owned by the assignee of the present application is disqualified as prior art. The present application is assigned to EMC Corporation (Reel/Frane: 015755/0377). Therefore Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-24, and 26-28 be withdrawn. The assignment is of record, being referred to in Applicants' Specification: "...EMC Control Center (ECC) application, marketed commercially by EMC corporation of Hopkinton, MA, assignee of the present application. (Page 16, lines 1-2).

Claim 1 has been amended with the limitations of claim 7 and 8 and the additional limitation "caching recently accessed relations to provide a cache of effected managed entities;" to further distinguish the claims. Support for this amendment can be found page 13 line 21. Applicants respectfully submit that Trinon is silent on using a cache and does not teach "traversing the cache of effected managed entities and selectively invoking a relation service operable to identify other managed entities effected by a particular managed entity according to the relations if no match is found in the cache." For at least this reason, claim

-12-

1 is patentable over Trinon. By virtue of dependency, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-6, 10 and 27 should also be in condition for allowance.

For analogous, reasons, claims 14, 15-20, and 22-23 should also be in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 has been amended with the limitations of claim 12. Several features in Applicants' are employed "(i)n order to avoid inundation of event traffic, recipients of events typically limit, or filter, scrutiny to a set of predetermined events. Accordingly, the configuration files 132 specifies types of events which the rule engine 124 receives and analyzes. Further, the configuration file specifies whether direct or indirect impact of the events is sought." Typically, a user elects indirect impact, in order to ascertain the attenuated impact, or effect, of a particular occurrence. If direct impact only is requested, then the rule engine performs analysis only of the objects directly affected by an event."

Applicants respectfully submit that Trinon does not teach or suggest:

"enumerating events operable to affect the selected object to be monitored;

and the Office Action admits that Trinon does not teach:

"selecting, based on a level of overview scrutiny of the network, objects indicative of performance to monitor, selecting the objects indicative of performance to monitor" and

"building, by **observing interconnections between the objects**, virtual relationships between objects, the interrelations indicative of a dependency relation between objects"

For at least this reason, claim 11 is patentable over Trinon. By virtue of dependency, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 13 should also be in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 26, as amended now includes the limitation "selecting, based on a level of overview scrutiny of the network, objects indicative of performance to monitor, selecting the objects indicative of performance to monitor," which the Office Action admits that Trinion does not teach. Therefore claim 26 is patentable over Trinion.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an online payment made herewith, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/Barry Gaiman/
Barry Gaiman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 42,562
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive, Suite 280
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: EMC04-12(04036)

Dated: November 3, 2008